

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FREDERICK SCHIFF,
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
et al.,
Defendants.

No. C-03-4345 MMC
No. C-04-2261 MMC
No. C-04-2262 MMC

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
SCHIFF AND MANSHARDT
DECLARATIONS SHOULD NOT BE
STRICKEN/DISREGARDED**

NARDA GILLESPIE et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
et al.,
Defendants.

MARK OSUNA,
Plaintiff,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
et al.,
Defendants.

/


1 Before the Court are four separate motions for summary judgment, noticed for
2 hearing January 13, 2006, and plaintiffs' oppositions thereto.

3 Defendants Fred Lau ("Lau") and the City and County of San Francisco ("City")
4 correctly note that part of the evidence on which plaintiffs rely has not been properly
5 submitted to the Court. In particular, Lau objects to the Schiff Declaration, attached to
6 plaintiffs' joint opposition to Lau's motion for summary judgment, on the ground it is not
7 signed; the City objects to the Declaration of Frederick Manshardt, cited in plaintiffs' joint
8 opposition to the City's motion for summary judgment, on the ground said declaration was
9 neither filed with the Court nor served on the City.

10 Accordingly, plaintiffs are hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing, no later
11 than January 12, 2005 at 4:00 p.m., why the entirety of such declarations should not be
12 stricken and/or disregarded by the Court.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: January 11, 2006


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge